

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
WHEELING**

ALLAH BURMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:16-CV-14
(BAILEY)**

ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert [Doc. 2]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R&R on February 16, 2016, wherein he recommends this Court deny as unintelligible the petitioner's Complaint, styled as "Application for Motion to Challenge 18 U.S.C. § 4107 Verification of Consent of Offender to Transfer from the United States."

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or

recommendation to which no objections are addressed. **Thomas v. Arn**, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); **Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The docket reflects that service was accepted on February 18, 2016 [Doc. 3]. No objections have been filed, and the time within which to do so has expired. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.


Therefore, upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the **Report and Recommendation [Doc. 2]** should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, this Court **ORDERS** that the petitioner's Complaint, styled as "Application for Motion to Challenge 18 U.S.C. § 4107 Verification of Consent of Offender to Transfer from the United States" **[Doc. 1]** be **DENIED AS UNINTELLIGIBLE**. The request for the hearing contained therein is also **DENIED**. This Court further **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of the respondent and to **STRIKE** this case from the active docket of this Court.

As a final matter, upon an independent review of the record, this Court hereby **DENIES** a certificate of appealability, finding that Mr. Burman has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: March 8, 2016.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE